

July 18, 1972

Approved For Release 2005/01/27 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000300230063-1

S 11093

Drugs

Total outlays	Eisenhower budget, fiscal year 1960	McGovern proposals, fiscal year 1975
Billions.....	75 (approx. 1975 dollars).	54.8 (1975 dollars).
Total active forces.....	2.5 millions.....	1.7 millions.
Army divisions.....	14.....	10.
Marine divisions.....	3.....	2.
Troops in Europe.....	379,000.....	130,000.
AF fighter/atlk. squadrons.....	61.....	54 (approx.).
Navy fighter/atlk. squadrons.....	80.....	20 (approx.).
Aircraft carriers.....	23 (14 attack carriers).	6 (1).
Conus air defense:		
SAMS.....	4,400.....	8 batteries.
AF fighter/interceptor Sqdns.....	65.....	5.
Economic and military aid.....	4.0 (approx. 1975 dollars).	1.4 (1975 dollars).

President Eisenhower was, to be sure, leery of committing ground forces on a large scale in SE Asia. What he would have done if faced with the situation that confronted President Kennedy in 1963 can be only a matter of conjecture for anyone. But the point is that he retained the flexibility to apply American military strength whenever and wherever he felt it to his advantage. Witness the swiftness with which he moved 13,000 troops—both Army and Marine—to Lebanon on July 16, 1958. Could Senator McGovern's proposed force structure support such an operation?

It is true, as Senator McGovern says, that my father as President always yearned for the day in which U.S. Forces in Europe could be reduced to the strength of one division—with supporting troops. He had held to that objective ever since he had accepted the position of Supreme Commander, Allied Forces Europe, in 1951. But he was also pragmatist enough to realize that his dream, in fact, was not materializing. It was predicated on a good deal more willingness on the part of the Europeans to carry their own share of the load than has actually turned out to be the case. At the time he left office 390,000 U.S. troops were still deployed in Europe, in contrast to the 130,000 advocated by Senator McGovern.

Today the U.S. is faced with a balance of payments situation that would doubtless be somewhat alleviated by reduction of our present strength of 300,000 troops in Europe. But I could never visualize President Eisenhower attempting to approach such a task by such a sudden, arbitrary and major cut to 130,000 which would, in my opinion, cause such despair on the European continent that nobody could predict the outcome. (The Europeans are already sufficiently skeptical regarding our willingness to risk our major cities to protect the 300,000 men we have there today.)

The basic difference in philosophy between the two men, as I understand them, is a corollary of what I have said above. President Eisenhower never subscribed to the belief that a unilateral force cut on the part of the United States would elicit similar moves on the part of the Communist world. Senator McGovern, from what I read, feels differently. He cites the unilateral suspension of nuclear testing during 1958-1959; but I can assure the reader that this action was taken with great discomfiture—and in the realization of the gigantic lead the United States then enjoyed in the quality of its nuclear weaponry. The actual philosophy Eisenhower expressed succinctly:

"Since an acceptable treaty for controlled disarmament was not realized, we continued to build an overpowering military establishment as the only feasible defense against the menace and probings of international Communism and as the indispensable platform from which to continue negotiations for a peaceful world."

Waging Peace, p. 483.

This line of thinking has been followed faithfully by the Nixon Administration and has begun to bear fruit.

Perhaps the most dramatic difference in viewpoint between President Eisenhower and Senator McGovern lies in the matter of our worldwide alliances, many of which are maintained by a program of Mutual Security (Foreign Aid). In Fiscal 1960, the administration asked Congress for funds in the amount of approximately \$4 billion (1975 value). Senator McGovern would cut this back to \$1.4 billion. Even while the President was fighting to obtain this sum—which he himself considered inadequate—one of his big opponents was the then Congressman George McGovern. By what stretch of the imagination, in examining this set of facts, can one consider McGovern as a "disciple" of Eisenhower?

These then are the differences. The only similarity in the military philosophy of McGovern and Eisenhower lay in the desire, shared by all, to keep military expenditures to the lowest level possible so that those funds can be used along more constructive channels. But the order of priorities places the two men poles apart.

Senator McGovern has courageously put forward his own views. He is entitled to do so and we should all be grateful that he has. But in listening to these views, let none of us be fooled by any self-serving association between George McGovern and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

CALIFORNIA CORRIDOR FEASIBILITY ACT

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, on June 29, 1972, shortly before the last recess, I introduced the California Corridor Feasibility Act, which called for a feasibility study of the desirability of a high-speed ground transportation system to connect the cities of San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Sacramento. I am delighted to add the distinguished majority leader (Mr. MANSFIELD) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) as cosponsors of this proposed legislation.

I would like to add several comments to my remarks on that system.

First, as I mentioned in my initial statement on the subject, I believe that the study would be undertaken in three parts: The route connecting the cities of San Diego and Los Angeles; the route connecting the cities of Los Angeles and San Francisco; and the route connecting the cities of San Francisco and Sacramento. It is imperative that such a separation be effected, because it is quite likely that the factors which prevail in one section of the California corridor will be very different from those which prevail in other sectors.

Second, it should be evident that the need for such a study is urgent. The dramatic increase in population which is projected for that corridor, combined with the staggering projected increases in demand for transport and travel between those cities provides persuasive evidence of the desperate need for some new system linking the cities in that corridor. It is uncertain what that system should be, but it is evident that some new system is imperative. A proper evaluation of those needs—undertaken now—will enable us to make an efficient and economical determination of the system that should be selected.

Finally, it must be clear that I am by no means wedded to any particular system. I believe that the TACV system is one of the systems that should be considered and other systems must be considered and

evaluated as carefully and as comprehensively. The technologies are not yet operative. The possibilities are not yet clear. Only the need is apparent. Accordingly I believe that it must be emphasized that all of the alternatives must be evaluated, so that the eventual decision is balanced and wise.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I hope that the study can begin as soon as possible, and that all of the alternative possibilities can be explored. The transportation needs of the citizens of California and the Nation deserve that prompt and careful consideration.

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF ILLICIT DRUG TRADE

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, during the recent congressional adjournment, I undertook, under the auspices of the Committee on Foreign Relations, a tour to study international aspects of the illicit drug trade—a trade which sustains an estimated half million addicts in the United States, ruining their lives, bringing sadness and misery to their families, and contributing to the increases in crime in our cities.

During my travels, I visited Heidelberg, Germany, to review the drug problems among U.S. troops in Europe and efforts to overcome such problems; Marseilles, France, where much of the morphine base is converted into heroin; Ankara and Afyon, Turkey, where poppies are grown and much of the morphine base originates; Tehran, Iran, where there is a limited maintenance program coupled with strict laws and law enforcement procedures; and London, which also utilizes a maintenance program. I was accompanied by John Ritch of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff and Lt. Lewis Hurst, head of the narcotics squad of the Norfolk Police Force.

I am currently preparing a report for submission to the Foreign Relations Committee and to the Senate. In the meantime, I am today submitting to the Virginia State Crime Commission, meeting in Richmond, a preliminary report summarizing some general findings. I had hoped personally to present my statement to the Crime Commission, which has reported that "trafficking in narcotics and dangerous drugs in the State is the most serious problem facing law enforcement," but business here in the Senate prevents my doing so.

My statement to the commission, based on an examination of drug trade in one area of the world, suggests that we must make a multipronged attack on the illegal drug problem: Our customs efforts must be maintained at the highest level possible; we must continue to build our defenses through improved local law enforcement; serious study and consideration must be given to the successes and failures of maintenance programs; we must continue to expand educational and rehabilitational efforts; and we must focus our criminal sanctions upon the dealer and pusher to such a degree that the risk will not warrant the huge profit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the testimony which I am today submitting to the Virginia Crime Commission be printed in the RECORD.

Approved For Release 2005/01/27 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000300230063-1

July 18, 1972

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., TO STATE CRIME COMMISSION AT VIRGINIA STATE CAPITOL, JULY 18, 1972

Initially, I should like to thank the members and staff of the Virginia State Crime Commission for inviting me to have this statement submitted at their organizational meeting. I regret that business in the Senate today prevents my appearing before you.

On June 30 I began a ten-day study of illicit drug traffic coming into the United States from abroad. There are three geographic areas that may be identified in the illegal flow of drugs. The first is a familiar route over which the flow has built up considerably since the end of the Second World War. The gum from opium poppies grown in Turkey is processed to morphine base, and sent overland through Germany or Italy or by sea to Marseilles where the morphine base is converted into heroin and shipped into the United States.

The second area is in Southeast Asia, encompassing parts of Burma, Thailand and Laos, known as the Golden Triangle. This area has facilities for the complete conversion from the gum of the opium poppy to heroin. More than half of the world's illicit production of opium is produced there. By several routes going east and west, the traffic moves to destinations on both the east and west coasts of the United States.

The third area is Latin America. Both hard and soft drugs are being illegally shipped into the United States from the Caribbean and Mexico. Some of this traffic originates in the other areas mentioned. Much of it, however, has its inception in this hemisphere.

Our trip had as its purpose to examine the old route that for years has involved Sicilian and Corsican brotherhoods and is reputed to be the source for the purest heroin available. The reasons for choosing this area as the initial phase of our study for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are understandable. First, the United States, through negotiations with Turkey and initiatives with the government of France, is seeking to eliminate or, at least, restrict this source of illegal narcotics. Millions of dollars, authorized by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, are being expended through Customs Services, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and international agencies to reduce the flow of illegal drugs. This great effort of the past few years has, in large measure, been concentrated along the Middle East-Munich-Marseilles route. Moreover, a protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1953, now pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, will be of great concern to the European nations along the route. I have chaired the hearings on the protocol and will probably manage the debate concerning it on the floor of the Senate.

A study of the Middle East-European route provided an opportunity to examine how effectively our money is being used abroad to combat illicit drug traffic; also, to consult with officials in other nations on the proposed treaty amendment. A report in greater detail will be filed in the near future as a Senate document. This statement will attempt no more than to relate general impressions which, hopefully, will aid in your important work on drug abuse in Virginia.

I was accompanied by John Ritch, of the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Lieutenant Lewis Hurst, head of the narcotics squad of the Norfolk Police Force. Lt. Hurst's vast experience in drug abuse was invaluable to our mission. Our conversations with police officials were aided immeasurably by his presence. I hope your Commission will be hearing from him.

In June 10, 1971, President Nixon and Premier Nihat Erim of Turkey announced that after the 1972 harvest of opium poppies in Turkey production would cease. They also stated that the 1971-72 crop would be rigidly controlled by the Turkish government. In consideration of this, the United States would provide money for technical assistance to Turkish farmers in cultivating other crops and to subsidize for loss of revenues. Earlier this year, I met with then-Premier Erim in Washington who advised me that after studying the effects of drug abuse in the United States, his government had agreed to the ban on the growth of opium poppies as a humanitarian gesture. He was confident that Turkey would stand by its agreement. Shortly after his return, Premier Erim was deposed and there has been speculation that the Turkish Parliament would overturn the decree. I found no evidence of this.

While the system of controls imposed by the government of Turkey is not perfect, I was impressed at the lengths to which the Turkish government is going to reduce leakage. Undoubtedly, there are some stores of opium gum which will trickle into illicit trade, but despite the protests in Parliament, the prevailing opinion, both among Turkish and American officials, is that the decree will not be reversed and that there will be no sizable opium crop grown in Turkey next year.

Our visits to Germany and France convinced me that the police authorities in those nations are increasing enforcement procedures against both smugglers and pushers. The German authorities are becoming more sensitive to growing domestic drug abuse. Germany has become more than a point of exchange for morphine base to be smuggled into France. Hard and soft drugs are readily available in the cities and we can expect greater and more coordinated initiatives on the part of German officials.

In France, it is obvious that the Pompidou government has directed major police and customs efforts to restrict the flow of drugs and to discover and close down the heroin laboratories.

Two such laboratories have been uncovered recently. We visited both of them in remote areas some miles out of Marseilles—relatively modest houses not easily seen from main thoroughfares. The equipment and supplies necessary to process the heroin are not expensive or sophisticated. The chemical skills required are a different matter.

In Marseilles we also saw the boat on which \$90 million worth of heroin supposedly bound for Florida was seized by the French authorities. This is the largest seizure in history.

Both American and French authorities believe that increased vigilance will bring more success in discovering laboratories and large shipments in transit. Their feelings about the prospects of ultimately curtailing most of the illicit traffic flowing through France might be described as reasonably sanguine.

I talked with agents of the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in Frankfurt, Marseilles, London, Ankara and Tehran, and am impressed by their activities in working with local and national officials of the countries in which they are stationed. These men came to their posts with the benefit of experience in the major cities of the United States. In their present posts, however, they are dealing with criminal elements that have operated across international borders for many years. Also, modern air travel, international trucking agreements, elements such as the large Turkish work force presently in Germany and the difficulties of customs inspection—particularly on ships and trains—make the task increasingly difficult.

It is my impression that the full force of our government is working at the diplomatic

and law enforcement levels to restrict the flow of illegal drugs through Europe into this country. I would characterize the attitude of those on the scene as mildly optimistic.

I must, however, note this caveat. Even should the Turkish source be contained, acres of opium poppies are being grown in Afghanistan, Pakistan and India. Moreover, those who have exported drugs into Saigon from the Golden Triangle will be looking for new outlets as American troops continue to be withdrawn from South Vietnam. I do not believe optimism about our prospects for continued success in Marseilles or probable success of the Turkish experiment should make us believe that drug abuse problems here at home are any nearer solution.

Just before I left on this mission, John E. Ingersoll, Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, told the Foreign Relations Committee that there are presently in the United States well over a half million persons addicted to hard drugs. This is double the statistics of two years ago. The new figures remind us that the hour is late here before the problem reaches epidemic proportions. We must continue our efforts at the international level. As long as ten kilos of opium can be purchased for a few hundred dollars, and the kilo of heroin produced from this can be sold on the streets of New York City in dosage units to produce hundreds of thousands of dollars, then smugglers and processors will find new routes, new methods, new locations for processing and will become increasingly flexible in their operations.

One can predict with reasonable certainty that the closing of laboratories in Marseilles will result in new operations in Germany, Italy or Spain. One can also predict that the harvest of Turkey will be replaced by the harvests of other nations.

We must leave no stone unturned in customs efforts at the borders of this country and enforcement measures with the harshest of penalties for those who smuggle and sell. It is also apparent that we must give serious study and consideration to the success and failures of maintenance programs at home and abroad, that we must continue to expand educational and rehabilitational efforts throughout the United States and that we must focus our criminal sanctions upon the dealer and pusher to such a degree that the risk will not warrant the huge profit.

Strengthened efforts to curtail the movement of narcotics into this country from abroad are essential but that alone is not enough. We also must continue to build our defenses at home through improved law enforcement, public education and expanded drug treatment and rehabilitational facilities.

Tragically, at a time when drug abuse is recognized to be our priority domestic problem, many states and communities face reductions in their programs as a result of recent changes in the Federal Safe Streets Act. Under new requirements which became effective on July 1, already financially strained states are asked to take on greater cost burdens in order to continue their participation. The hard, cold fact is many of the states are unable to do so. According to one survey, some 17 or 18 states, including our own Commonwealth of Virginia, and numerous local jurisdictions have no choice but to cut back on drug treatment and prevention programs which are among the major activities funded by Safe Streets grants.

It is estimated that even after appropriating additional funds above the budget recommendation, Virginia stands to lose about \$1.5 million over the next two years in Federal action grants which otherwise would be available to it. This at a time when this Commission reports that "trafficking in narcotics and dangerous drugs in the State is the most serious problem facing law enforcement." This at a time when many community groups throughout the State are organizing efforts

on a volunteer basis to do something about drugs.

How can we explain to these parents and community leaders and young people that while they are moving ahead the Federal government is moving backwards in terms of funding the necessary facilities and materials to support their efforts? How can we explain the gap between the rhetoric on this subject and the commitment to do something about it?

Early this year, I introduced a bill (S. 3137) which would provide partial relief for hard-pressed states and communities. Specifically, the bill would delay for one year the hard-match funding requirement which requires states to put up cash rather than being able to credit equivalent value goods and services towards their share of the program. My bill is a partial solution but vitally important in terms of the serious drug and crime problem the program is meant to relieve.

Although the deadline of July 1 for the new hard-match requirement has come and gone, I believe the measure can be made retroactive and I know the relief offered by the bill would be welcomed by states and localities even if it is not enacted until this fall.

I have asked the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, which has jurisdiction over the matter, to consider S. 3137 as an amendment to any appropriate measure before it which has some chance of enactment this session.

Specifically, I have requested that the bill 8389 which passed the House on November 1, 1971, by a vote of 350 to 2. That measure would amend the Safe Streets Act to authorize use of LEAA funds for prison narcotics treatment programs and would be an ideal vehicle for my amendment to the Act. The Subcommittee is scheduled to meet in executive session this week. I am hopeful that action will be taken.

I have no wish to be an alarmist, but your Commission has recognized drug abuse as the number one crime-related problem in the Commonwealth of Virginia today. We are making commendable progress in our efforts abroad to fight illicit drug traffic at the source, but our progress to date, when weighed within the context of the enormous and complex problem posed by the lucrative drug traffic, might be compared to having run a good 100 yards in a mile-long race.

Allow me to commend you for the work thus far of this fine Commission. I know you will not relax your efforts because of our progress at the international level and I urge that no stone be left unturned to combat drug abuse throughout Virginia.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY FOR THE ORDER OF AHEPA

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. President, this year the Order of AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, will be celebrating its golden anniversary. This association is a nonpolitical, nonsectarian organization whose goal has been to promote civic leadership by its membership and provide an understanding and appreciation for the ideals of Hellenic culture which are the roots of our Western civilization.

Many prominent Americans have been members of Ahepa including Presidents Roosevelt, and Truman, several cabinet members, U.S. Senators and Representatives. In my own State of Minnesota, the local chapter of Ahepa has members who are friends of mine and respected individuals in the Greek American communities of Rochester, Duluth, St. Paul, and Minneapolis.

AHEPA chapters throughout the country have carved out an important role

in their communities, contributing greatly to the advancement of Greek-American causes and cultural ties.

In due recognition for the work that the Order of AHEPA has done and will continue to do, I take this occasion, Mr. President, to extend my congratulations and best wishes on its golden anniversary.

BUSING OTHER PEOPLE'S CHILDREN

Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. President, the summer issue of the Public Interest contains two items which should be studied by every Senator—and every citizen—before we proceed any further in the direction of forced busing.

The first item is a letter from Prof. James Coleman, the author of the "Coleman Report," which has been used—or, it would seem, misused—by busing advocates to justify busing.

Professor Coleman wrote this letter to the New York Times. The Times would not print it, presumably because the letter might inconvenience the Times in its advocacy of one of its principle passions—the busing of other peoples' children.

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Coleman's letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

COLEMAN ON "THE COLEMAN REPORT"

The following letter, by Professor James Coleman, was sent to the New York Times on April 13th. The Times having failed to find space for it, we are here inserting it into the public record of the debate on busing and school integration:

Dear Sirs: Although I make it a practice to stay away from reporters, some statements of mine were printed in Sunday's (April 9) Times. I want to clarify several things concerning the findings of the so-called "Coleman Report," and the use of those findings by governmental institutions, including the courts:

1. The Report found, as I have testified in various court cases, and as has been confirmed by numerous further analyses of those same data, that the academic achievement of children from lower socio-economic backgrounds (black or white) was benefited by being in schools with children from higher socio-economic backgrounds (black or white).

2. This achievement increment is not nearly sufficient to overcome the educational disadvantage of children from lower socio-economic backgrounds.

3. This effect, however, was greater than those of other school resources of the kind ordinarily added by compensatory programs. The effects of these resources on achievement can hardly be found at all.

My opinion, with which others who have more experience in constitutional law than I may disagree, is that the results stated in 1 and 3 above have been used inappropriately by the courts to support the premise that equal protection for black children is not provided unless racial balance is achieved in schools. I believe it is necessary to recognize that equal protection, in the sense of equal educational opportunity, cannot be provided by the State. Most of the inequality of opportunity originates in the home, through loving care and attention by parents—but differential care and attention since parents differ—and the State can hope

only to add opportunity in such a way that these inequalities are not increased but reduced. This does mean, of course, that actions of the State that have increased racial or socio-economic segregation should be corrected by the courts, but not on the mistaken assumption that they are thereby creating equal educational opportunity.

While the issue of racial integration in schools does not, I believe, involve constitutional questions of equal protection for black children conditional upon increased achievement in integrated schools, it is a matter on which school boards and governmental authorities have a responsibility to take affirmative action—action with a less punitive and blunt quality than some court decisions, but affirmative action nevertheless. In the past 20 years, there has been an increasing self-segregation into homogenous communities by those families that have greatest freedom to move. The result is an increasing social and economic segregation in the schools, which makes a mockery of the classic American conception of the common school attended by children of all social groups.

Probably the most cogent recent statement on this issue is that made by the New York Board of Regents on March 24, in reaffirming its stand on school integration. The Board of Regents did not mention constitutional equal protection of black students because of greater achievement in integrated schools, but said rather, "This Board cannot foresee any but the most sullen and corrosive scenarios of the future if the multi-colored and multicultural children of this state and nation are not permitted to get to know one another as individuals."

Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. President, the second important item in the summer issue of the Public Interest is an article by Prof. David J. Armor. Professor Armor is on the faculty of the department of sociology at Harvard University. His article is titled "The Evidence on Busing."

The editors of the Public Interest published the following remarks by way of an introduction to Professor Armor's article:

Rarely can an unpublished academic article have attracted as much attention and publicity as has this analysis of busing. Professor Armor, a sociologist who specializes in research methods and social statistics, played a leading role in research on the Boston METCO study, which was one of the earliest evaluations of the effects of busing on black students. In this article he reports the detailed findings of that study plus those of several other comparable studies. While his manuscript was being copy-edited in our office, its findings were being "reported" in the national press (e.g., New York Times, Washington Post, Boston Globe), and they have even been denounced publicly by critics who have never seen the results of the studies themselves.

We are publishing the full text of this academic article—all the graphs, footnotes, and references are included at the end—because we think that, in so controversial a matter as busing, it is important to be as precise as possible, even at the risk of pedantry. Inevitably, findings such as those of Professor Armor give rise not only to public but also to scholarly controversy. In our next issue we shall print comments on Professor Armor's article by other scholars.

Mr. President, although the RECORD can not reproduce the charts and graphs that accompany Professor Armor's article, I ask unanimous consent that his article and footnotes and bibliography be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

These two items, Professor Coleman's